

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 16-18, 27, 33, and 36-38. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito, (US 2002/0116285 A1). In maintaining the Examiner's previous rejection, the Examiner stated that:

"Applicant argued that the described dual devices comprise the Internet access device and the mobile terminal and the described dual networks comprise the first communication network and the public land mobile network. However, the language of the claim is vague because an Internet access device and a mobile terminal could be the same device. Likewise, a first communication network and a public land mobile network could be the same network."

The Applicant extremely appreciates the Examiner's explanations and has now further amended the pending independent claims to overcome the vagueness and to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention. More specifically, independent Claim 1 has now been amended to recite:

"wherein said Internet access device and said mobile terminal being two separate devices and said first communication network and said PLMN being two separate networks"

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim language now clearly recites "two different devices over two different networks." Applicant further submits that similar limitations have been added to the remaining independent claims.

Applicant therefore earnestly believes that the now amended independent claims are patentable over the cited references and the claim vagueness identified by the

Examiner has been clarified. A Notice of Allowance for all pending independent claims and their respective dependent claims is earnest requested.

### **3.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By John C. Han  
Registration No. 41,403

Date: April 7, 2006

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686  
john.han@ericsson.com